IttesaaI-Journal of Connecting Discourses
Volume 1, Issue 1, 2024
ISSN (E): 3105-5257
ISSN (P): 3105-5494
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64984/ijcd.1.1.2024.03
https://journal.ehya.com.pk/ijcd/

Article QR

Evolution of Societies: A Comparative Study of Ibn Khaldun and Herbert Spencer

Arjmand Zahra
Independent Researcher, New York, USA
Email: arjmandzahra17@gmail.com

Received: December 05, 2023
Revised: March 29, 2024
Accepted: April 02, 2024
Published: 24-June-2024

Citation: Zahra, Arjmand, "Evolution of Societies: A Comparative Study of Ibn Khaldun and Herbert Spencer." *Ittesaal Journal of Connecting Discourses* 1, no. (2024): 29–40. https://doi.org/10.64984/ijcd.1.1.2024.03

Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Abstract

Ibn Khaldun is renowned as a remarkable Islamic historiographer and a political philosopher, while Herbert Spencer is known as a Social Darwinist and a western positivist. Comparing both these legends would be fascinating due to the obvious differences between their cultural, temporal and philosophical foundations. However, both have significant contributions in the field of Sociology. In the philosophical understanding of history comprehending the science of society has been an age-old concern. Both these eminent thinkers provided a key to understand social development and complex nature of societies. Since their ideas share a common vision to unearth universal laws governing social cohesion, state formation, and historical change. For a comprehensive understanding, this paper will analyze the legacy, theories, methodologies and goals of Ibn Khaldun and Herbert Spencer separately in Section 1 and section 2. Whereas, the focal point of section 3 will be to compare and contrast their works with respect to their contributions in the domain of Sociology. The current study aims to signify the importance and relevance of both these legends in the current era through comparative analysis. The paper shall conclude by highlighting the insights of both thinkers that have enable contemporary sociologists to develop an understanding of society in a holistic manner.

Keywords: Social Evolution, Science of Culture, Social Darwinism, Positivism historiography

Ibn Khaldun

Abd al-Rahman Ibn Khaldun (commonly known as Ibn Khaldun, 1332-1406) is an eminent Muslim philosopher, historian and social scientist of the Islamic Golden Age. His famous work is a VII volume work *Kitab al-'ibar*. However, the first volume is often separately known as *Muqaddimah* (1377).[1] The first volume itself is considered as an unparalleled master piece.[2] The key ideas in his works are: *Asabiyah* (roughly translated as theory of Social Solidarity or social cohesion).

[1]H. Simon, Ibn Khaldun, and F. Rosenthal, "The Muqaddimah. An Introduction to History," *Oriens* 15, (1962): 435. https://doi.org/10.2307/1579869.

[2]Walter J. Fischel, "Ibn Khaldun's Use of Historical Sources," *Studia Islamica*, no. 14, (1961): 109, https://doi.org/10.2307/1595187.

1.1. Literary Contributions

Ibn Khaldun wrote a seven-volume book aiming to narrate Arab's history. In doing so, he deemed it necessary to discuss historical methodology so that one can segregate historical truth from error.[3] Owing to the unique subject matter of volume 1, *Muqaddimah, an Introduction to History* became an unparalleled work appreciated by scholars worldwide.[4] Based on his volumes, his work can be divided into following subsections:

Table 1. Breaking Ibn Khaldun's Intellectual Work *Kitab al-'ibar*

Volumes	**Major Works covered**	**Description**
BOOK I (Also known separately as *Muqaddimah*)	Philosophy of History and society	Provides methodology to study history and created the science of culture.
BOOK II & III	Sociology of Politics	For him "history is an endless cycle of flowering and decay"[5]
BOOK IV & V	Sociology of Urban Life and Economics[6]	World history up to his own time[7]
BOOK VI & VII	Sociology of Knowledge	History of Arabs, Persians and Berbers[8]

1.2. *Asabiyah:* A Theory of Social Cohesion

It is noteworthy that nearly all of his works revolves around a central concept, namely, *Asabiyyah*. *Asabiyyah* is a complex concept which is alternatively described as 'group solidarity,' 'social cohesion,' 'group consciousness,' and sometimes as 'tribalism.' "The science of culture has its own subjects, human society and its own problems; the social transformations that succeed each other in the nature of society"[9]

According to Ibn Khaldun, economics, politics and education are held together by social cohesion (*Asabiyyah*); and societies are held together by the power of social cohesiveness which can be augmented by the unifying force of religion.[10]

[3]Charles Issawi, "Ibn Khaldūn - the Muqaddimah: Ibn Khaldūn's Philosophy of History," In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 2020, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Ibn-Khaldun/The-Muqaddimah-Ibn-Khalduns-philosophy-of-history

[4]Abd Al-Raḥmān B Muḥammad Ibn Ḵaldūn Ibn Ḵaldūn, (Trans). Franz Rosenthal, N. J. Dawood, and Bruce Lawrence, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History* (Princeton University Press, 2015); Syed Farid Alatas, *Applying Ibn Khaldūn: The Recovery of a Lost Tradition in Sociology* (Routledge, 2014), 42-53.

[5]Anthony Giddens, *Sociology*. 5th ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2006), 111.

[6]Dieter Weiss, "Review of *Ibn Khaldun on Economic Transformation*," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 27 (1), (1995): 29–37. https://www.jstor.org/stable/176185; Joseph J. Spengler, "Economic Thought of Islam: Ibn Khaldun," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 6 (3), (1964): 268–306. https://doi.org/10.2307/177577.

[7]Walter J. Fischel, "Ibn Khaldun's Use of Historical Sources," 109; Abdesselam Cheddadi, *The World until 1400 According to Ibn Khaldun* (Taylor & Francis, 2024).

[8]Abdesselam Cheddadi, *The World until 1400 According to Ibn Khaldun*.

[9]Y. Lacoste, *Ibn Khaldun: The Birth of History and the Past of the Third World* (London: Verso. 1984), 58-63.

[10]Anthony Giddens, *Sociology*.

1.3. The Science of Culture and the Impact of *Asabiyyah* on the Rise and Fall of Civilizations

Based on his theory of social cohesion, he claimed that we can understand both the behavior of a society as well as how social change occurs. Social change and the rise and fall of societies follow laws that can be empirically discovered; and that reflects climate and economic activity as well as other realities.[11] Moreover, the inevitable weakening of complex combinations like psychological, sociological, economic and political factors declines a dynasty or empire; and prepares the way for new one.[12] The rise of new dynasty or civilization favors the group or nation with stronger cohesive force and social solidarity.[13] To support his theory, he gave numerous examples.[14] However, due to limited scope of this paper, we can't go into minute details.

The factors that affect *Asabiyyah* enumerates: blood ties, shared ancestry and experiences, geographic proximity and economic interdependence, strong leadership; and religious and cultural unity.[15] Furthermore, these factors may overlap each other for stronger or weaker social cohesion.

1.4. Modern-day Relevance

One may ponder why Ibn Khaldun's *Asabiyyah* remained popular in this millennium even centuries later.[16] The answer is quite simple, that his concept is still relevant in the modern era.[17] One can easily comprehend and correlate his theory of social cohesion with modern day political movements, nationalism, ethnic and religious conflicts and even organizational behaviors.[18] By referring to the factors the influences *Asabiyyah*, we can gain valuable insight to incorporate social changes and reform in our societies.

Khaldun's work has been acknowledged worldwide, however, some scholars argued that his concept of *Asabiyyah* is too deterministic and rigid. They believe that it fails to include other factors that can affect human behavior, such as economic conditions, technological innovations, and individual agency.[19] Regardless, his elaborated works are closely related to modern sociology and greatly appreciated by the West.[20] Arnold Tonybee (1889-1975) proclaimed that as a

[11]A. Ab Halim, "Ibn Khaldun's Theory of Asabiyyah and the Concept of Muslim Ummah," *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, 9 (1), (2014): 1–12, https://doi.org/10.22452/jat.vol9no1.1.

[12]Anthony Giddens, *Sociology*.

[13]M. Önder, and F. Ulaşan, "Ibn Khaldun's cyclical Theory on the Rise and Fall of Sovereign Powers: The Case of Ottoman Empire," *Adam Akademi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8 (2), (2018): 271–307. https://doi.org/10.31679/adamakademi.453944.

[14]Abdesselam Cheddadi, *The World until 1400 According to Ibn Khaldun*

[15]Joseph J. Spengler, "Economic Thought of Islam: Ibn Khaldun," 208-306.

[16]Muhammad Dhaouadi, "The Concept of Change in the Thought of Ibn Khaldun and Western Classical Sociologists," *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 16 (July), (2006): 43–87. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/isad/issue/68663/1078621.

[17]Joseph J. Spengler, "Economic Thought of Islam: Ibn Khaldun," 208-306.

[18]Dieter Weiss, "Review of *Ibn Khaldun on Economic Transformation,*" 29-37.

[19]Mohideenbawa Riswan, "Ibn Khaldun's Contribution and Its Criticism: A Sociological Review," *Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences* 45 (1), (2022): 45. https://doi.org/10.4038/sljss.v45i1.8217

[20]Mahmud Dhaouadi, "Review of *An Exploration into Ibn Khaldun and Western Classical Sociologists' Thoughts on the Dynamics of Change,*" *Islamic Quarterly* 30 (3), (1986), https://www.proquest.com/openview/1fbda9964a06051f0188c8093c0ee01e/1?cbl=1818767&pq-origsite=gscholar.

philosophy of history there is no match for Ibn Khaldun's work neither before his time nor afterwards.[21]

2. Herbert Spencer

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) works expand in a wider range be it biology, science, sociology, ethics, psychology or political philosophy.[22] He was a British polymath of 19th century indeed who gained fame and lost it due to the controversy regarding his evolutionary sociology. His evolutionary works are influenced by none other than Charles Darwin (1809-1882), thus earning him the name Social Darwinist. However he extended Darwin's view in his political philosophy, so one can also visualize Lamarck's influence on him as well. Positivism, *laissez-faire*, evolution & utilitarianism are his main areas of interests. Based on these interests, Spencer contributed wide range of works including *Synthetic Philosophy*, *Social Statics*, and *Essays on Education*, *First Principles*, *The Principles of Biology*, *The Principles of Psychology*, *The Principles of Sociology*, *and The Principles of Ethics*. Although he worked on wide range of topics; but our focus in this chapter will be to comprehend his works revolving Social Darwinism, society and laissez-faire system.

2.1. Spencer: A Biologist or Cosmologist?

Spencer took Darwin's concept of 'natural selection'[23] to a whole new level. It is to be noted here that there is a misconception regarding the phrase 'survival of the fittest'. Many confused this slogan and tribute this to Darwin; however, the term was originally coined by Spencer himself.[24] Evolution is the crux found in his every work upon which he endeavors to build a system from humanity to society; militancy to industrialization. He advocated that advance and superior cultures or nations will override inferior ones.[25]

In *First Principles* (1862), he gave three basic principles of the universe, namely:

I. 'Law of the Persistence of Force'
II. 'Law of the Instability of the Homogeneous'
III. 'Law of Multiplication of Effects.'

[21]Charles Issawi, "Ibn Khaldūn - the Muqaddimah: Ibn Khaldūn's Philosophy of History," In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 2020, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Ibn-Khaldun/The-Muqaddimah-Ibn-Khalduns-philosophy-of-history

[22]Very few men are privileged to encompass wide range of subjects as Spencer did. It was mostly due to 0his fortunate life experiences in Victorian era where he was born to a religious dissented father George Spencer. He was never born to submit to any authority. In his later years, he became Secretary of Derby Philosophical society whose founder was none other than the Physicist Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of Charles Darwin. It is obvious that during his tenure he was exposed to ideas of Erasmus Darwin & jean- Baptiste Lamarck. He became well-versed in mathematics, Latin and Physics. For almost 5 years he accepted a post of a sub-editor in free trade journal *The Economist*, whose publisher John Chapman introduced him to renowned thinkers & writers of his time including J.S. Mill (1806-1873), T.H. Huxley (1825-1895), G.H. Lewes (1817-1878), George Eliot (1819-1880), Harriet Martineau (1802-1876). These in turn introduced him to the world of Logical Positivism and acquainted him with Auguste Comte. [See A. Harris, "Distributed Leadership and School Improvement: Leading or Misleading?" *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 32, (2004): 11-24, https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143204039297].

[23]Natural Selection is Darwin's theory that the most well adapted individual in the population will survive and reproduce.

[24]The terms 'Survival of the fittest' is coined by Spenser in his work *Principles of Biology* (1864) after reading Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859).

[25]This view is similar to Ibn-Khaldun's concept of Asabiyyah, history is a continuous process of flower and decay. See M Michael Rosenberg (ed.), *An Introduction to Sociology* (Toronto: Methuen, 1987).

The 'Law of the persistence of force' entails that external force on matter affect it differently; and 'law of multiplication of effects' denotes that any particular change caused by that external force may bring forth a new variety.[26] The 'Law of the Instability of the Homogeneous' is associated with homogeneous Universe which is becoming heterogeneous due to changing forces. He refers instable characteristics to homogeneous because of variable force.[27] "And because of the Law of the Multiplicity of Effects, heterogeneous consequences grow exponentially, forever accelerating the tempo of homogeneity evolving into heterogeneity."[28] Spencer qualifies this external force as unknown and absolute. These laws could be termed as his meta-physical laws for the cosmos. For this reason many scholars, including Alberto Mingardi, regarded Spencer as a cosmologist rather than a biologist.

2.2. Spencer as Sociologist (Concept of Society)

In one of his work, *The Social Organism* (1860), he compared living beings with society; arguing that just as living being evolved via adapting natural traits, societies evolve through analogous process. On this basis, society can be viewed as a social organism driven by natural laws of the universe. Due to the interjection of evolutionary philosophy or biological ideas, in the concept of society, his view is widely known as Social Darwinism. Furthermore, he compared that bodies and societies have better chances of survival as a whole rather than treating them as individual parts or components.[29]

In his *Principles of Sociology*, Spencer suggests that social evolution possess two universal stages:[30]

- Militant Societies
- Industrial Societies

Militant society denotes rigid and authoritative government that restrains and regulates behavior of an individual member. It is here that Spencer coined the phrase "survival of the fittest" to describe the competition among individuals and groups. Militancy is effective and positive only if it is resisting an attack.[31] Its nature is hierarchical and authoritative and its members are sub-ordained. On the contrary, hierarchical system in industrial societies is restricted within government and army, i.e. they form a representative government. Their basic purpose is social welfare and peace. While militancy uses force for social cooperation, industrialism uses voluntary consent.[32]

[26]George Ritzer, *Introduction to Sociology* (Los Angeles Sage, 2018).

[27]See David Weinstein, "Herbert Spencer," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, eds., Edward N. Zalta. December 15, 2002. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/spencer/ (accessed March 29, 2020).

[28]See David Weinstein, "Herbert Spencer," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

[29]See Alberto Mingardi, *Herbert Spencer*, Edited by John Meadowcroft, Vol. 18 (New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011), 32-37.

[30]See David Weinstein, "Herbert Spencer," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*

[31]See Alberto Mingardi, *Herbert Spencer,* 57.

[32]Mingardi, *Spencer,* 58.

According to Spenser, societies originated due to three reasons:

- desire to companionship
- safety from war (combined action against enemies)
- mutual aid for sustaining life

These three reasons also depicts why division of labor is essential adaptive trait for progress of society. This division of labor also differentiates between militant and industrial societies.[33]

Spencer maintained that evolution and progress are inter-related. The only difference is that humans adapt through evolutionary traits while society adapt through progress. This progress enables man to move forward from militancy to industrialism.[34] Throughout his works, Spenser endorses industrialism and free market system by bounding it to his concepts of freedom and justice in order to legitimize them.[35] "The industrial type of society was for Spencer the ultimate social output of evolution, as he conceived it. In society, as in nature, "Progress is not an accident, not a thing within human control, but a beneficent necessity' The industrial type was a society more 'developed' and more 'individualized,' where an ever more complex division of labor brought by an increasing differentiation between individuals."[36]

2.3. Defending Individuality, Egoism and Freedom

Spencer was a liberal individualist who was open to the ideas of progress. He preferred individuality over society; and science over religion. According to him, individual characteristics develop through evolutionary progression from simple to more complex and diverse states. [37] One may point out that Spencer deliberately summarized society and organism analogy on biological grounds so that it would not interfere with his idea of individualism; because society undermines individuality on a holistic level for the greater good. In defense of individuality, Spencer wrote:

We have a tolerably decided contrast between bodies – politic and individual bodies. It is well that the lives of all parts of an animal should be merged in the life of the whole, because the whole has a corporate consciousness capable of happiness or misery. But it is not so with a society; since its living units do not and cannot lose individual consciousness, and since the community as a whole has no corporate consciousness. This is an everlasting reason why the welfare of the citizens cannot be sacrificed to some supposed benefit of the State, and why, on the other hand, the State is to be maintained solely to the benefit of citizens. The corporate life must here be subservient to the lives of the parts, instead of the lives of the parts being subservient to the corporate life.[38]

On these lines, he maintained individualism by suggesting that biologically different parts of body do not possess consciousness until they are taken as a whole organism. However, when it comes to society, the same rule doesn't follow because society as a whole does not undermines individual's consciousness.

[33]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 58.
[34]See Mingardi, *Spencer*, 57.
[35]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 57.
[36]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 60.
[37]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 34.
[38]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 32-33

2.4. Laissez-Faire - Spencer as Political Philosopher

Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy* (1896) is an endeavor to build a system based on evolution. Among his themes, individual freedom is his utmost goal.[39] Yet individual is responsible for his actions, he can be free as long as he doesn't harm any other individual. This is where justice and beneficence enters in the picture; and sympathy is their root.[40] Thus reward and punishment is the consequence of one's deed. In one of his *Essays* he wrote, "This is a form of 'survival of the fittest' that imbued the history of humankind: but in industrial society, this was not the survival of the physically stronger but rather 'the survival of the industrially superior and those who are fittest for requirements of social life."[41] In order to live, one must strive; this struggle becomes kinder in industrial societies as compare to oligarchies.[42]

Spencer established political system on narrow definition of government. The sole purpose of government is to administer justice and to defend natural rights of men. He narrows down functions of government to judiciary and police. Moreover, he rejected notion of common good due to its vagueness. For him, justice is defined as protection of human rights (right to life and right to property etc.); and injustice is violation of those rights.[43] Beneficence, on the other hand, is not endorsed rather it is an offspring of sympathy.[44] Moreover, his works includes separating religion from governance. This entails that the role of government is not to teach religion; likewise, the role of religion is not to regulate natural rights of man.

2.5. Attacking Laws for Poor

Spencer was against laws for the poor because, to him, it undermines strength of the society. "Destitution can be the result of inappropriate conduct. Society rewards thrift and punishes laziness. By feeding the undeserving it not only takes away the punishment, but it also destroys the most powerful incentive to reformation."[45] In addition, it also burdens the working class poor by rewarding idle.[46] Thus, without incentive there would be very little or no productivity. Unlike its opponents, free market system doesn't claim perfection yet it is more feasible than its peers as it promotes productivity and urges people to work and alleviate from their poor stance.[47] Therefore, He endorses free trade.

2.6. Defending Property Rights

Spencer categorizes property rights as 'expedient,' i.e., although practical and natural they are possibly immoral or improper. This is because it provides a perfect incentive to economic

[39]See Mingardi, *Spencer,* 42.
[40]See Mingardi, *Spencer,* 69-70.
[41]Herbert Spenser, "The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State," *The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State and Other Essays* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1885), 127.
[42]Herbert Spenser, "The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State," 71.
[43]Herbert Spenser, "The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State," 37.
[44]The development of altruistic moral sentiments was an essential factor in the evolution of humanity. He was also convinced that, with the evolution of society and morals, the rich would be ever devoting more energy to furthering the material and mental progress of the masses. From Mingardi, *Spencer,* 71. and Herbert Spenser, "The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State," 150.
[45]Mingardi, *Spencer,* 39.
[46]Mingardi, *Spencer,* 68.
[47]Mingardi, *Spencer,* 39.

growth.[48] Spencer proposed that property rights are natural as it is granted by God himself in addition to human inclination to own land.

2.7. Views on War

Although evolutionary thinkers are often criticized of promoting wars, genocide etc. as in case of Adolf Hitler who sets out to purify German race from Nazi's; however, Spencer was against war.[49] He clearly stated in 5th letter of *Social Statics* (1850) that war neither benefit humans nor any economy.[50] It is like a drug providing artificial stimulation to its bearer (a weak politician) for a short while giving him false hope to prosperity. "Civilized world,… instead of having been engaged in invasions and conquests, had directed its attention to the real sources of wealth – industry and commerce, science and the arts".[51] In other words, his evolutionary concept doesn't endorse wars but progress and growth in economy through globalization, trades and mutual links. Nonetheless, he does assert that defensive wars are necessary for one's survival. Spencer was a humanitarian indeed. He opposed imperialism and colonialism on humanitarian grounds.

2.8. Criticism

2.8.1. As Social Darwinist

Despite a sound evolutionary system Herbert Spenser's work couldn't beat the ideas that his fellow social Darwinists upholds. Social Darwinism generally visualizes "wealth and power as symbols of inherent fitness while poverty is evidence of natural inferiority."[52] While it is obvious that Spencer view was totally opposite but misconceptions spread faster than his works, "in the late 19th-20th century, Social Darwinism argued for unrestrained economic competition and against aid to "unfit" poor. The theory justified racist, colonist and imperialist policies in Europe and United States."[53] Richard Hofstadter also criticized that Spencer's philosophy is nothing but an apology for laissez-faire.[54] Due to obvious ethical and moral concerns his approach on social Darwinism was undermined. Consequently, Spencer's reputation as a sociologist and philosopher declined as well.[55] As Alberto Mingardi wrote in this regard: "The label of social Darwinist that sticks to Spencer's name up to our times- reveals a common suspicion that he was 'insensitive' to the plight of the poor. In this respect, Spencer shares the fate of many other advocates of the market system who are understood to prize allocative efficiency over any other social goal."[56]

2.8.2. Peace Versus War

Following the term 'survival of the fittest', it was misunderstood as gaining superiority over the weak. This justified colonialism, racism, imperialism, genocide and wars. However, we can clearly see from above mentioned Spencer's work that he was against war; and he endorsed peace

[48]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 39.
[49]He condemned Afghan and South African war (1899). He commented that white savages are overrunning the dark savages everywhere and that they were entering an era of cannibalism in which strong nations are devouring the weaker. Mingardi, *Spencer*, 64.
[50]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 40.
[51]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 41.
[52]George Ritzer, *Introduction to Sociology*.
[53]George Ritzer, *Introduction to Sociology*.
[54]See David Weinstein, "Herbert Spencer," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*
[55]M Michael Rosenberg (ed.), *An Introduction to Sociology.*
[56]Mingardi, *Spencer*, 68.

as it is fruitful for change, growth and progress. He was only against the aid to unfit poor and that too because the working labor class will suffer; and idles would lack incentive to work at all. This may not be an issue for the developed nations, but for under developing nations Spencer was right on the mark. For instance, take an example of beggar mafia, their earning is more than that of a labor worker in Pakistan. In such cases, why would they choose a respectable means to earn when they can earn more for free.

Nonetheless, Spencer was against militancy and was promoting industrialism as it focus on division of labor essential for progress. He was indeed a humanitarian though misunderstood due to social Darwinist label.

2.8.3. Egoism Versus Altruism

As a philosopher who promotes individualism, he fails to demarcate between his ideas of freedom and altruism that is born out of sympathy. How could both be reconciled? Fair enough that he limits individual freedom and self-interests so that it won't harm anyone; but it doesn't collaborate how a person with an altruistic morality can pursue his self-interests, liberty and individuality. The only possible solution is when one's self-interests are of altruistic nature. This argument isn't plausible according to Kant's Deontological principles.

Throughout his works it seems that Spencer was either trying to seek a mean between two extremes; or somewhere his works were misunderstood due to the tag of 'Social Darwinist,' which he could not erase being an evolutionist. T. H. Huxley suggested building a system for Spenser's work by eradicating and reinterpreting conflicting things from his theories.[57] In spite of all the criticism, Herbert Spencer is considered as one of the greatest thinkers of 19th century.

3. Comparative Analysis

Based on our understanding of Herbert Spencer and Ibn Khaldun from section 1 and 2, we can summarize their similarities and differences. Both Ibn Khaldun and Spencer were systematic thinkers trying to explain civilizational development each emphasizing the internal causes of social change rather than mere external conquest or economic shifts. Likewise, both of them proposed a diagnosis of decline and a theory for renewal or evolution.[58] The following table shows a brief analysis of differences in their approach.

Table 2. Comparative Analysis

	Ibn e Khaldun	**Herbert Spencer**
Timeline	(1332-1406) 14th Century	(1820) 19th century
Area	Tunisia, modern day Algeria [North Africa] (Eastern World)	England (Western world)

[57]M Michael Rosenberg (ed.), *An Introduction to Sociology*.

[58]Muhammad Dhaouadi, "The Concept of Change in the Thought of Ibn Khaldun and Western Classical Sociologists," 43-87.

	Ibn e Khaldun	Herbert Spencer
Contributions	Known as an eminent Muslim philosopher, sociologist and historian	Social Darwinist and positivist
Major Works	*Muqaddimah*	*Principles of Sociology*
Impact of region and philosophical movements	Political instability in the Muslim regions; and the decline of Islamic civilizations	Industrial Revolution, capitalism and classical liberalism
Influences	Ibn Khaldun work is considered original and one of its kind.	Charles Darwin and Lamarck
Major Social Theories	*Asabiyah* (Social Cohesion)	Liberalism, survival of the fittest, evolutionary model of society
Sociological Stance	Used social historiography and social cohesion (*Asabiyah*) to explain human behavior and governance	Used evolutionary biology to explain society as living organism
Role of Religion and Morality	Integral part of law, state-building and unity	Religion is transitional; and morality can exist without religion
Causes of rise and fall of civilizations	Tribal solidarity leads to rise; whereas extravagance. Loss of social cohesion and lack of morality leads too fall of civilization[59] A nation can rebuild with strong religious or tribal leadership again	Adaptation to environment and competition leads to rise, while failing to adapt would contribute to demise of a nation. However, a nation can rebuild itself again by minimal state interference and evolutionary adaptation
Popularity in modern era	He is still influential in modern Sociology and often known as the father of Philosophy of history owing to his unparalleled work.[60]	Spencer's work was famous in early 19th century[61] However, due to immense criticism on Social Darwinism, his popularity also diminishes.

[59]M. Önder, and F. Ulaşan, "Ibn Khaldun's cyclical Theory on the Rise and Fall of Sovereign Powers: The Case of Ottoman Empire," *Adam Akademi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8 (2), (2018): 271–307. https://doi.org/10.31679/adamakademi.453944

[60]Anthony Giddens, *Sociology*.

[61]Mahmud Dhaouadi, "Review of *An Exploration into Ibn Khaldun and Western Classical Sociologists' Thoughts on the Dynamics of Change.*"

3.2. Significance of Both Social Theorists

In spite of the differences between their cultural and temporal contexts, both Ibn Khaldun and Spencer endeavored to provide a systematic understanding of society.[62] This paper has examined both empirical approaches with the prime focus on their social theories, historical methodologies and philosophical orientations. Ibn Khaldun approached his subject matter using religious lens while Spencer used liberal lens. Regardless, both are considered legendry as evolutionary thinkers. Nonetheless, Spencer's popularity diminished over time; but Ibn Khaldun remains popular as his work is still considered much ahead of its time. He is widely read as a sociologist and a father of history.

Bibliography

Ab Halim, A. "Ibn Khaldun's Theory of Asabiyyah and the Concept of Muslim Ummah." *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, 9 (1), (2014): 1–12, https://doi.org/10.22452/jat.vol9no1.1.

Alatas, Syed Farid. *Applying Ibn Khaldūn*: *The Recovery of a Lost Tradition in Sociology*. Routledge, 2014.

Cheddadi, Abdesselam. *The World until 1400 According to Ibn Khaldun*. Taylor & Francis, 2024.

Dhaouadi, Muhammad. "The Concept of Change in the Thought of Ibn Khaldun and Western Classical Sociologists." *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 16 (July), (2006): 43–87. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/isad/issue/68663/1078621.

—. "Review of *An Exploration into Ibn Khaldun and Western Classical Sociologists' Thoughts on the Dynamics of Change*." *Islamic Quarterly* 30 (3), (1986), https://www.proquest.com/openview/1fbda9964a06051f0188c8093c0ee01e/1?cbl=1818767&pq-origsite=gscholar.

Fischel, Walter J. "Ibn Khaldun's Use of Historical Sources." *Studia Islamica* 14, (1961): 109. https://doi.org/10.2307/1595187.

Giddens, Anthony. *Sociology*. 5th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2006.

Harris, A. "Distributed Leadership and School Improvement: Leading or Misleading?" *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 32, (2004): 11-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143204039297

Ibn Ḵaldūn, Abd Al-Raḥmān B Muḥammad. Franz Rosenthal, N. J. Dawood, and Bruce Lawrence. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Issawi, Charles. "Ibn Khaldūn - the Muqaddimah: Ibn Khaldūn's Philosophy of History | Britannica." In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 2020, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Ibn-Khaldun/The-Muqaddimah-Ibn-Khalduns-philosophy-of-history.

Lacoste Y. *Ibn Khaldun: The Birth of History and the Past of the Third World*. London: Verso. 1984.

[62]Mahmud Dhaouadi, "Review of *An Exploration into Ibn Khaldun and Western Classical Sociologists' Thoughts on the Dynamics of Change.*"

Mingardi, Alberto. *Herbert Spencer*. Edited by John Meadowcroft. Vol. 18. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011.

Önder, M. and F. Ulaşan, "Ibn Khaldun's cyclical Theory on the Rise and Fall of Sovereign Powers: The Case of Ottoman Empire." *Adam Akademi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 8 (2), (2018): 271–307. https://doi.org/10.31679/adamakademi.453944.

Riswan, Mohideenbawa. "Ibn Khaldun's Contribution and Its Criticism: A Sociological Review." *Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences* 45 (1), (2022): 45. https://doi.org/10.4038/sljss.v45i1.8217.

Simon, H., Ibn Khaldun, and F. Rosenthal. "The Muqaddimah. An Introduction to History." *Oriens* 15, (1962): 435. https://doi.org/10.2307/1579869.

Spengler, Joseph J. "Economic Thought of Islam: Ibn Khaldun." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 6 (3), (1964): 268–306. https://doi.org/10.2307/177577.

Spenser, Herbert. "The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State." *The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State and Other Essays.* Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1885.

Weinstein, David. "Herbert Spencer." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Edited by Edward N. Zalta. December 15, 2002. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/spencer/ (accessed March 29, 2020).

Weiss, Dieter. "Review of *Ibn Khaldun on Economic Transformation.*" *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 27 (1), (1995): 29–37. https://www.jstor.org/stable/176185.